

**Sundry Queries tendred to such as are,
or profess themselves to be Ministers of
JESUS CHRIST, for clearing the Doctrine of
the FOURTH COMMANDEMENT. And the
LORDS SABBATH DAY.**

To all that are, or profess themselves to be the Ministers of Jesus Christ; These ensuing Queries are humbly presented to be considered, for the clearing of the truth in this weighty controversy, about the SABBATH DAY.

Querie. 1.



Hether the Fourth Commandement, express, *Exod 20.* be not *Morral* and perpetual, as well as the other nine be, yea or no?

Quer. 2. Whether the scope and drift of that fourth Precept, be not to perswade us to lay by the works of our calling *one day in seven*, that we may on that day wholly, give up our selves to wait on the Lord, in the

performance of duties of piety and mercy, for our attaining of, and growing in sanctification and holiness?

Quer. 3. Whether the fourth Precept, do not as strictly bind us to keep holy *the seventh day*, of or from the Creation, as it bindeth us to the observance of a *seventh day*?

Quer. 4. If the seventh daies Sabbath, be not *Morral* and perpetual, then how comes it to pass that it was instituted, or appoin-

Be leavers are put under the Law Cough or
 Anger: but in love are wholy Royal
 to Christ: 1 Cor. 9. 21. Jam. 1. 25. Ja. 2. 10. 11. Rom.

ted from the first Creation, when man by guilt stood in no need of a Saviour; nor yet of such a ceremony, *Gen. 2. 3.*

Quer. 5. If the seventh dayes Sabbath be not Morrall, and belonging both to Jews and to Gentiles: Then how comes it to pass that it was given to all men in *Adam*, when there was no difference between Jew and Gentile? and was observed by command from the beginning, as appears by comparing together, *Gen. 2. 3.* and *Exod. 16. 18.* to 31.

Quer. 6. If when our Lord Jesus saith, *Matt. 5. 18.* that *till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle should in no wise pass from the Law.* If he there meant not the Law of the ten Commandments, exprest in *Exod. 20.* then what Law did he mean?

Quer. 7. If the seventh dayes Sabbath be not Morrall, but an abrogated ceremony now since the death of Christ; then wherefore should our Saviour instruct his beloved Apostles, that must instruct christian Churches to pray, *Matt. 24. 20.* that they might not fly on the Sabbath, knowing that their flight would fall out more than thirty yeares after his death?

Quer. 8. If there be a day instituted or appointed for holy, instead of the Sabbath, without a word or warrant from God: how much doth this come short of will worship?

Quer. 9. If there be any word from the Lord, or from any of his Apostles, Prophets, or Evangelists, for the changing of the day; from which of them is it, or where is it written?

Quer. 10. If there be no text of scripture that warrants the changing of Gods holy rest, from the seventh day to the first day of the week; wherefore should we follow *Rome* the mother of harlots, in this unwarrantable practice?

Quer. 11. If there be never so weighty reasons found in the judgements of men, for the changing of the day, whether is that a sufficient ground to change it, without a word from God?

Quer. 12. Whether you find any part of all the New Testament, or any christian Author for one thousand five hundred yeares after Christ, that in any Book or writing, or relation at any time; did call the first day of the week the Sabbath day: ifso, shew who, and in what Book, or writing it is so?

Quer. 13. Whether you find not that as in all the New Testament, which was all written after Christs death, for the use of all christians

christians to the worlds end, so also in all *Latian* and *Greek* christi-
an *Authors*, the seventh day, (which now from the heathens cus-
tome is named *Saturday*,) is alway, in all their writings both Civil
and Ecclesiastical, called *Dies Sabbati*; as well as in all the *Parliam-
ent Rolls* of *England*, and what that providence speaks forth,
that they never made so bold with that day, as they did with all
other daies, to which they gave heathenish names.

Beloved and much honoured, the reasons of my troubling you
with this great business at this time, is, the weight and worth of
this truth; for the knowledg of the *Lords Sabbath*, and the holy
observation of it, doth eminently tend to our help and further-
ance in Sanctification and holiness; and there be very graci-
ous promises made to them that shall sanctifie the Sabbath, *Isa.* 56. 2,
3, 4, 5, 6, 7. and 58. 13, 14. &c. which makes me esteem it a truth
of great worth.

But Secondly, I find the judgments of men very much at a loss
about the Sabbath: *Some* saying that the Sabbath is now abollish-
ed, and so there is none since the coming of Christ; neither are
we bound to keep any day holy now. *Some others* there be as
learned as any, and the most considerable for number, that say the
old Sabbath is abollished by the Church; and the first day of the
week is made holy instead thereof; and that the Church hath au-
thority so to do. *A Third sort* of men there be which say, the day
was changed by Christ, for the honour of the work of Redemption.
Now I do freely acknowledg unto you, that with none of these three
opinions I am at present satisfied.

For the *First of them*, I cannot easily believe that that Law
which was given at the creation, *Gen.* 2. 2, 3. and was spoken by
the Lords own voice from heaven, out of the midst of the fire,
Exod. 19. 20. 1. *Dant.* 4. 12. 13. and 5. 22, 23, 24. and which al-
lone was writ with his own fingers in Tables of stone to be kept in
the Ark, and that are so carefully distinguished by *Moses*, from
the statutes and judgments which he taught *Israel*; and he hath
described them by the name of *Ten Commandments*, *Exod.* 31.
18. and 32. 15, 16. and 34. 28. *Dent.* 4. 13, 14. and 5. 22. and
9. 10. 11, 15, 17. and 10. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. should be any of them
abollished: I must have better ground to believe it, than any at
present I see, or else I cannot believe it.

The *Second Opinion* seems to me altogether as bad, or worse than the former; that the Church should have any such power in works of this nature, seems to me altogether unlikely, the Lord so frequently forbidding her, to add to his word, or diminish from it, *Deut.* 4. 2. and 12. 32. *Isa.* 1. 7. *Prov.* 30. 6. *Revel.* 22. 18. 19. Again, Christ is said to be in all things head to the Church, *Ephes.* 1. 22. and we have one Law giver, *Iam.* 4. 12. we read of no more. Again, the transgressing of the Commandments of God, to bring in the traditions of men, was vain worship in Christs time, and so condemned by him, *Mat.* 15. 3, 6, 9. and therefore a sin now sure; and if this change must be admitted of as good, upon this account; I see not how we can avoid falling back to *Babylon* again, & receiving all *Romes* traditions, although never so contrary to the Scriptures.

To the *Third Opinion*, I am as hard to be reconciled as to the former. First because I find no word in the Scriptures evidencing this, that Christ did change the day. Secondly of that any of his followers did it by his authority, nor yet the least mention made of any such reason in the word, as the work of Redemption, or the Resurrection of Christ, as a cause of the change thereof; but that the Church in its Apostacy did change it, I doubt not, as shee hath done all other the Lords holy ordinances: But that there is any the least warrant from the word of truth for her so doing, is all the doubt. But further, the scriptures are flat against it; our Saviour would not have us think he came about any such business, *Mat.* 5. 17, 18, 19. Therefore I do beseech you all, in the fear of God, take this matter into your serious consideration, and shew some good ground from the scriptures for your neglect of keeping the Lords holy Sabbath; and your suffering the people to live in this great sin of making the Lords holy day, their greatest working day; through the whole Nation, or else repent your selves, and persuade the people to repentance also; as you will answer it at the great day of account.

But now because there is some shew of proof brought for this *Third and last Opinion*, therefore I shall examine it before I leave it. And as for what is alledged from *John* 20. 19. it can be no proof of their keeping the first day of the week as a Sabbath, although they met together, for in *Luke* 24. 11. 13. it appeareth evidently they did not believe that Christ was risen from the dead, therefore they could not keep the day by his appointment for the honour thereof.

Secondly

Secondly, two of the Disciples went a journey of *threescore furlongs* that same day; which going and coming was not less than *fifteen miles*, too much for a *Sabbath daies journey*, when it is to go from the Assembly of the Saints. And Thirdly they kept the day next before it holy, *Luke 23. 56.* and it is not like they kept two *Sabbaths* together. And as for what is alledged from *verse 26.* that *he appeared to them again after eight daies*, It needs no more answer but this, That if it were after eight daies, as the text saith it was, then it ~~must~~ ^{could} be upon the eighth day, and so it can be no proof in that case, and as for what is affirmed by some, that all Christs appearances after he arose were on the *first daies* of the week: I say it wants proof from the scripture, but if it were so, it would be so farre from proving it a *Sabbath*; that it would prove it the contrary: For the *third* time in *John*, of his appearing to them, he found some of them *afishing*, and he reproveth them not, but set them to work: *look John 21. from the 1. to the 15.* And as for that text, *Acts 20. 7.* I say thus, it is to be enquired of them that bring this text, to prove that the *Sabbath* is changed; whether the *breaking of Bread* here, must needs be meant of the *Lords Supper*; or may it not rather be understood of common eating? seeing breaking of bread is as well used for common eating, as in *Acts 2. 46.* But it seems more likely for this reason also, because *Paul* was to take his leave of them on the morrow morning. But that which is most clear against this opinion is, the season in which they brake bread, it being after midnight, not an usual hour for this duty of remembering Christs death; and as may appear, was not done as a *Sabbaths daies work*, for if they met in the day light before, and kept it a *Sabbath*, then this after-midnight in which they *brake bread*, could be no *Sabbath*, it belonging unto the second day of the week: for this is evident by scripture, that the night of every day, goeth before the day, *Gen. 1. 2, 5. 8, 13, 19, 23. 1. Levit. 23. 32.* But if they met in the *night* of the first day of the week, that goeth before the day light, and is part of that day, then is it evident that the first day of the week is no *Sabbath*, because *Paul* set forward on his journey in that very morning, and so this text falls short of being any proof of the change of the *Sabbath* likewise.

Also might be inquired, whether that word *Preached* that is there put in, in *Acts 20.* be properly translated or no, and whether the same word in all other places, be not alwaies translated *discour-*

* Therefore
no ground
of faith

"Luk. 24
30. 35
Lu. 9. 16
Mar. 26
Mat. 14
Ch. 36

sed

sed, or *reasoned*, and never translated *Preached*; and if generally so translated in all other places, then was it not so improperly translated here, as if it should prove the first day of the week to be kept a Sabbath, for want of clearer or better proof?

There is yet a text more brought, 1 Cor. 16. 1, 2. to prove a changing of the Sabbath also, but it is commonly alledged with this addition, *when you meet together on the first day of the week*, just as if it were so written in the text indeed; whereas there is not one word of the *Churches meeting or coming together* in the text, but only of each mans *laying aside by him in store something for the poor Saints at Jerusalem, according as God had prospered him*; that so at Pauls next coming to them, their charity might be ready to be sent away. So that in this text there is no room for any man to prove, that on the first day of the week here was any *Church-meeting*, or *Sabbath-days work* appointed to be done, but rather a *considering* what good bargains had been made the week before, and a *looking over Shop-books and casting up Accounts*, to see how God had blessed their labors the week before, and what might be spared out of their gains, to make a purse for the poor Saints of Jerusalem, this is the clear import of this text, for how else shall men *lay by them according as God hath prospered them*, unless they take account how he hath prospered them; now Paul appointing this work to be done upon the first day of the week, it shews plainly that the day is no Sabbath, and it is most likely it was so appointed, to prevent the doing of it at the latter end of the week, lest it should occasion their intrenching upon the Sabbath for the doing of it.

There is also one other text, that is summoned in commonly to appear for proving the change of the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first day of the week, Revel. 1. 10. *I was in the Spirit on the Lords day*. Now by what rule of scripture these men call the first day of the week the *Lords day*, I know not, no text of scripture that ever I read of, ever knew it by that name yet, or by any other name but only this, *the first day of the week*: but indeed the seventh day is known by the name of the *Lords day* very well in the scriptures, the Lord himself gave it this name, Exod. 20. 10. and the Prophet *Isaiah* knew it by this name, Isa. 58. 13. So that if we will permit the scriptures to be judge in this case, they will give the name of the *Lords day* to the seventh day; but if we will needs have

the *first day* of the week to bear away this noble title, it must have it from some old tradition only, now it is not hard for me to believe, that the Church might soon corrupt her self, and superstitiously observe the *first day* of the week for the honour of Christs Resurrection, as tradition gives us an account they did observe the *sixth day* also for the honour of his death; for in how short a time did the true Church of God miscarry, as farre as this comes to; and drew Aaron the High Priest into the snare with them for company, in making a day holy to the Lord, *Exod. 31 5 6*. So also might the Church soon after the Apostles death, set a part the *first day* of the week upon a godly intension, and yet upon some superstitious account, and when they had so done, it would not be at all hard to honour it with the name of the *Lords day*: But further, the Papists themselves confess in their Commentary upon this very text, that *the first day of the week is kept holy by tradition, and not by authority of scriptures*, also from Ecclesiastical history, *Socrates Book 5. Chap. 21*. It is plain, that *all Churches came together to break bread* in remembrance of Christs death *on the Sabbath day*, for some hundreds of years after Christ, but *onely the Church of Rome, &c* which (saith the history) *used to do it on the first day of the week, upon an old tradition*: So that if men be willing to see from whence the changing of the day came, it will not be hard to find it out.

For the other two Opinions, I shall not at present trouble my self further with them, because their ill comp'exion seems to promise, that they will dye of themselves.

So leaving my writings to your reading and consideration, I remain,

*Your servant, and the servant of all men,
for the truths sake,*

W. Salter.

Her Priests have violated my law, and have profaned my holy things, they have put no difference between the holy and profane; neither have they shewed difference between the unclean and the clean; and they have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths and I am profaned among them. Ezek. 22. 26.

Blessed is the man that doth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil. Isa. 56. 2.

FINIS.
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
New York